DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 350 565 CS 011 044

AUTHOR Otto, Beverly
TITLE Evidence of Cohesive Harmony in Reconstructed Beginning Reader Texts and Complex Trade Book Texts by Emergent Readers.
SPONS AGENCY Spencer Foundation, Chicago, Ill.
PUB DATE Apr 92
NOTE 52p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 20-24, 1992).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Beginning Reading; Coherence; Inner City; Kindergarten Children; Primary Education; Reading Research; *Text Structure; Urban Education
IDENTIFIERS Cohesive Harmony; *Emergent Literacy; *Retelling; Text Factors; Trade Books

ABSTRACT

A study explored emergent readers' reconstruction of two story text types for evidence of cohesive harmony. Data came from a subset of 12 kindergarten children in 2 classes in an inner-city school. All of the children participated in a storybook reading program in which two types of texts were used: simple, beginning reader text and complex, trade book text. Analysis of children's storybook reconstructions by text type prior to systematic exposure to the two text types indicated individual differences in cohesive harmony. Children's differential exposure to the two text types during the storybook reading program was associated with different levels of cohesive harmony in reconstructed texts for some storybooks. No significant increase in cohesive harmony at posttesting was indicated across classes for either text type or for repeated text. Findings suggest that a complex relationship exists among text type, exposure, and cohesive harmony. (Six tables of data and two figures presenting excerpts from reconstructed texts are included; 47 references and a list of the books used with the students are attached.) (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED350565

Evidence of Cohesive Harmony in Reconstructed Beginning Reader Texts and Complex Trade Book Texts By Emergent Readers

Beverly Otto
Department of Curriculum & Instruction
Northeastern Illinois University

The research in this paper was supported by a grant from the Spencer Foundation. A special thanks is extended to Dr. Beverly Cox for her assistance in scoring the data and in reacting to a draft of the paper. Presented at the AERA Conference San Francisco, CA.

Running head: COHESIVE HARMONY

CS011044

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Beverly Otto

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

This study explored emergent readers' reconstruction of two story text types for evidence of cohesive harmony. The term story reconstruction is used to refer to children's attempts to read a familiar storybook prior to being able to do so conventionally. Cohesive harmony analysis was selected as a way of exploring children's text-making knowledge because cohesion is a principle, identifying feature of any text (Halliday & Hasan, 1976), contributing to a sense of unity, and a continuity between segments of the text. Data for this study came from a subset of kindergarten children in two classes in an inner-city school (Otto, 1991a, in press). All of the children participated in a storybook reading program in which two types of texts were used: simple, beginning reader text and complex, trade book text. Analysis of children's storybook reconstructions by text type prior to systematic exposure to the two text types indicated individual differences in cohesive harmony. Children's differential exposure to the two text types during the storybook reading program was associated with different

levels of cohesive harmony in reconstructed texts for some storybooks. No significant increase in cohesive harmony at post-testing was indicated across classes for either text type or for repeated text. Based on these results, a complex relationship appears to exist between text type, exposure, and cohesive harmony. Limitations of the study are discussed along with implications for future research in exploring the relationship between exposure to text types and children's use of cohesive harmony in text-making tasks.

Evidence of Cohesive Harmony in Reconstructed Beginning Reader Texts and Complex Trade Book Texts by Emergent Readers

This study explored emergent readers' reconstruction of two story text types for evidence of cohesive harmony. One of the implicit goals of emergent literacy research has been to describe the child's gradual acquisition of literacy-related knowledge, and how that knowledge contributes to the acquisition of conventional literacy (Doake, 1979; Dyson, 1981; Holdaway, 1979; Morrow, O'Conner & Smith, 1990; Schickedanz & Sullivan, 1984; Sulzby, 1985; Teale & Sulzby, 1985).

While studies of children's compositional abilities (i.e. creation of text) usually occur after conventional reading and writing have been acquired (Cox, Shanahan & Sulzby, 1990; King & Rentel, 1981), emergent literacy research has reported that young children have composition-related knowledge prior to exhibiting conventional reading and writing (Cox, 1991, in press; Otto, 1991b; Sulzby, 1985; Sulzby, Barnhart & Hieshima, 1989; Temple, Nathan, Burris & Temple, 1988).

Since emergent readers and writers are not yet reading and writing conventionally, research exploring the emergence of compositional behaviors and knowledge must involve a task that does not require or assume conventional literacy skills. One task that appears suited for such exploration is a child's attempted reading of a familiar storybook. Past emergent literacy research has described children's attempted readings as "pretend readings", "story re-enactments", or simply "reading" (Doake, 1981; Holdaway, 1979; Sulzby, 1985).

In this study the term story reconstruction is used to refer to children's attempts to read a familiar story book prior to being able to do so conventionally. The use of this term reflects a Piagetian perspective which sees children as actively constructing knowledge based on their interactions with their environment (Clay, 1991; Willert & Kamii, 1985). This term also acknowledges the role of social interaction in children's emergent literacy (Morrow, O'Connor & Smith, 1990; Teale, 1981; Vygotsky, 1962). When an emergent reader interacts with a storybook, the child appears to

be actively reconstructing the text based on his/her linguistic knowledge, memory for text, and graphic cues found in book illustrations (Otto, 1991b). Similar activity has been described for the composing process. According to Temple, Nathan, Burris & Temple (1988), "in composing, children are challenged to juggle the interests of self, audience, topic and purpose" (p. 119).

Earlier emergent literacy research has indicated that young children reared in a literate environment, but not yet conventionally literate, are able to create "text" and treat it as an object of knowledge (Sulzby & Otto, 1982). Research has begun to explore early text-making knowledge by examining children's reconstructed text for evidence of particular structures. The structure of texts created by children has been examined at the whole text level using story grammar (Stein, 1978; Stein & Glenn, 1981) and Vygotskiian-based categories of narrative complexity (Applebee, 1978). Children's early reading attempts have been described as oral language-like or written language-like (Sulzby, Barnhart & Hieshima, 1989).

Inner text features (cohesive devices and cohesive harmony) present in young children's conventionally produced texts have also been studied (Cox, 1983; Cox & Sulzby, 1984; King 1989; King & Rentel, 1981).

Cohesive harmony analysis was selected as a way of exploring children's text-making knowledge in this study because cohesion is a principle, identifying feature of any text (Halliday & Hasan, 1976), contributing to a sense of unity and a continuity between segments of the text.

Cohesive harmony analysis represents a refinement (Cox, 1987; Hasan, 1984; Pappas, 1981) of previous techniques that examined children's compositions for specific cohesive devices (Chapman, 1987; Cox 1983; Cox & Sulzby, 1984; Garber, 1979; Speaker, 1989; Spiegel & Fitzgerald, 1990). Pappas (1985) concluded that cohesive harmony analysis was an alternative way to examine children's story compositions. Friedman & Sulzby (1987) describe the value of using cohesive harmony analysis to explore a text's representational unity but caution researchers to also examine the contributions of pragmatic and macrostructural

features.

Cohesive harmony analysis focuses on the way specific cohesive devices function within and across t-units to create patterns of semantic and syntactic information. It involves a detailed analysis of noun (participant) tokens for their semantic and identity relationships. Verb (process) tokens are placed into one of seven process categories (Halliday, 1985). Participant tokens having similar relationships then become part of a chain; likewise for process tokens (c.f. Cox 1987; Hasan, 1984). Implicit functional grammar roles are assigned to each participant according to the type of process token related to it (Halliday, 1985).

Cohesive harmony interactions are then determined by noting where the same functional grammar roles occur for members of noun and verb chains across multiple t-units (Hasan, 1984). An index of cohesive harmony is calculated by comparing the number of central tokens, (i.e. tokens whose functional grammar roles interact across t-units) to the number of total tokens in the text. This index has been referred to as the cohesive

harmony index-total (CHI-total). The CHI-total has a potential range of .00 to 1.00, with values closer to 1.00 indicating high cohesive harmony.

Recent research has indicated good readers at the elementary level create stories that are more complex and cohesive than stories created by poor readers (Cox, Shanahan & Sulzby, 1990; Cox, Shanahan & Tinzmann, 1991). Yet children receive little formal instruction on cohesion devices (Baumann, 1986).

Cohesive harmony analysis has only recently been used to analyze texts created or reconstructed by emergent readers and writers (Cox, 1990; Cox & Hoon, 1991; Otto, 1990, 1991a). These studies concluded that many emergent readers and writers produce texts with linguistically significant levels (Hasan, 1984) of cohesive harmony. The study reported here continues this examination of emergent readers' compositions by focusing on cohesive harmony as it is found in reconstructed story texts of two types: simple beginning reader texts, and complex trade book texts. The selection of these two text types as well as the procedures for establishing student familiarity with

the texts was based on a review of related emergent literacy research.

Research that has examined emergent readers' storybook reconstructions has usually recognized the need to use storybooks with which the child is moderately familiar and which have a narrative structure (Doake, 1981; Genishi & Dyson, 1984; Holdaway, 1979; Morrow, O'Connor & Smith, 1990; Sulzby, 1985). Emergent literacy research has explored children's interactions with storybook texts assuming a generic role, acknowledging only that storybooks should be the ones with which the child is familiar. An implicit assumption of previous research seems to be that a child's responses to one text are representative of emergent literacy knowledge, and although children use different texts their behaviors could be compared. Few studies have documented children's exposure to specific texts used in the research tasks (See further Barnhart, 1991; Cox, 1991; Otto, 1984, in press), yet memory for text is influenced by repeated exposure (Kintsch, 1972; Otto, 1991b).

Other potentially influential variables often have

been overlooked or dealt with in a limited way, such as text complexity and patterns of rhythm, rhyme, and repetition in emergent literacy research. Tompkins & McGee (1989) reported that when patterned texts were used, children's own story compositions reflected similar patterning. Bridge (1986) found pattern books helped children decode their first words.

Current early childhood curriculum materials encourage the use of predictable text as a way of encouraging and supporting children's attempts at story reconstruction and shared reading (Jewell & Zintz, 1990; Morrow, 1989). Further, Morrow (1989) differentiates six categories of predictable books; repetitive phrases, rhyme, familiar sequences, cumulative patterns, familiar/popular stories, and stories with conversations/dialogue.

Formal reading instruction in a basal system typically uses simple, short texts which may also be characterized by repetition of phrases, rhythm patterns, or dialogue. Storybooks with very simple, brief texts have reportedly been used successfully with emergent readers by McCormick & Mason (1986), as a

"minimal intervention strategy that fosters early reading" (p.1). Although their methodology required children to recite the written text until the story was known, they reported that children were able to transfer new literacy knowledge to texts they had not seen before and that contained different words. McCormick and Mason concluded that by having readable stories at home, children were able to read familiar as well as new stories more accurately, while using more written-like language.

Thus, while several researchers have focused on using predictable or simple, brief texts and providing storybooks for children to use at home, no study to date has compared children's reconstruction of text types. Such a comparison has implications for the classroom since controversy currently exists between using a whole language literature-based approach and the basal, subskills approach to reading instruction.

The study reported here compared children's reconstruction of simple, beginning reader text with their reconstruction of more complex text typically found in trade books ("literature"). Data for this

study came from a subset of children in a storybook reading program in which the two types of texts were used. Analysis of children's pre and post emergent reading behaviors in the larger sample using Sulzby's Emergent Reading Ability Judgments Scale (1985) has been reported elsewhere (Otto, 1991b; in press). Analysis of a subsample of children within this larger project was undertaken to explore specific text-making knowledge represented by cohesive harmony.

The research by Cox (1990, Cox & Hoon, 1991) and Otto (1990, 1991a) reviewed above indicated young children's reconstructed texts contain significant amounts of cohesive harmony; however, it is not known whether children's use of cohesive harmony changes over time. Nor is it known whether children's reconstruction of text types will be associated with different levels of cohesive harmony. These issues formed the basis of the study reported here.

The study centered on four questions. First, will children's reconstructions of each text type, prior to the systematic exposure to text types, show differences in cohesive harmony at pre-assessment,

early in the kindergarten term? If significant differences are found, we can conclude that the use of cohesive harmony is influenced by factors operating prior to kindergarten enrollment.

The second research question examined whether children's exposure to different types of text (simple, beginning reader text, and complex trade book text) would be associated with different levels of cohesive harmony in their subsequent text reconstructions. Cohesive harmony is a property of text regardless of the length or syntactic complexity. A simple, brief text can be highly cohesive as can a more syntactically complex text. The question is, though, which text type is associated with children's use of higher cohesive harmony in text reconstruction? If exposure to either text type is associated with text reconstructions having higher cohesive harmony, then that text type may be a factor in developing children's knowledge of how to create a text.

The third research question explored the development of children's use of cohesive harmony over time. Will children's reconstruction of text types

show an increase in cohesive harmony between pre- and post-assessment? If an increase is observed, developmental factors may be involved or, increased exposure to storybooks during the study may have influenced the use of cohesive harmony.

The fourth question focused on the role of text familiarity in children's use of cohesive harmony in their text reconstructions: will pre-post measures of children's reconstructions of the same text show increasing cohesive harmony? If memory for text plays a role in reconstructing text, then a highly familiar text would be expected to have higher use of cohesive harmony than a less familiar text. If there is no clear relationship between text familiarity and the use of cohesive harmony in text reconstruction, then other variables are influencing the use of cohesive harmony.

Method

Subjects

This study was drawn from data collected in two kindergarten classes at an inner-city school in a large midwestern city from October through January. Both classes were taught by the same teacher. Children in

this subsample were from a larger study (n=28) which examined emergent literacy using Sulzby's scale (1985) for assessing emergent reading ability of favorite storybooks (Otto, 1991a; in press). This subsample (n=12) of the larger study was composed of children from both a.m. and p.m. classes who independently reconstructed both types of texts at both data collections. While the analysis of text fragments reconstructed in assisted interactions would also be fruitful, it was not included in this study.

The children represented a variety of cultural and ethnic backgrounds. Six children who were limited in their English proficiency took part in the program, but were dropped from this data analysis as they did not interact with the storybooks independently.

Procedures

The storybook sharing program consisted of the following: every two weeks for a period of fourteen weeks, children were introduced to a new storybook. After each book was introduced, it was read at group storytime several times during the subsequent week. The teacher emphasized comprehension of the story and

asked questions to clarify vocabulary or concepts. She was directed not to encourage the children to recite story lines or to attempt to "read" the text. A copy of the book was also placed in the children's classroom storybook corner. At the beginning of the second week, each child was given a personal copy of the storybook to take home, with their name written on the front cover.

Both classes' enrollment was determined by the school's administration of a traditional readiness measure. These two classes represented the highest levels of readiness (with four other sections of kindergarten representing middle and lower levels of readiness). The teacher used the same reading curriculum (formal, subskills approach) with both classes. For the purposes of this study, however, each class was exposed to a different type of story text throughout the 14 weeks. After the preassessment had been completed, the morning class was read and given only trade books with complex text and the afternoon class was read and given only beginning reader texts (See Appendix A). A total of seven books were given to

each child throughout the project.

For the purpose of pre and post assessment, the procedures were slightly different for the first and last books. In the pre-assessment, both classes were read a complex storybook text and a beginning reader for one week at storytime. During the subsequent week, the children were interviewed individually and asked to read each book to the researcher. When a child did not respond to the read request, subsequent prompts encouraged the child to "do your best, give it a try," "pretend" (Sulzby, 1985). For continued refusals, an assisted reading (Otto, 1984) was initiated by the researcher. In addition to audiotaping the session, the researcher took brief notes after each taping session. For the post assessment, a different beginning reader and trade book were used along with a third book, a beginning reader which had been used in the preassessment. This provision provided a repeated measure of reconstructing the same text. Neither the children nor their teacher were aware that the same book would be used in both assessments.

The story texts reconstructed orally in response

to the read request were examined for evidence of cohesive harmony. Audio recordings of children's storybook reconstructions were transcribed and parsed prior to analysis.

The books representing the two text types used in the pre- and post-assessment were similar with respect to the number of t-units and overall cohesive harmony (See Table 1).

Insert Table 1 about here

The beginning reader books had syntactically simple text which contained a predominate repetitive pattern and was relatively short in length. The trade books were characterized by text that was syntactically complex, of extended length, and had a small proportion of repetitive phrases.

The two books used during the preassessment were a trade book, Mr. Gumpy's Motor Car (Burningham, 1973), and a beginning reader, Mrs. Wishy Washy (Crowley, 1980). For the postassessment, another trade book with complex text was used, Harry the Dirty Dog (Zion,

1956), along with two beginning readers: Mrs. Wishy Washy (Crowley, (1980), and Stop! (Crowley, 1982).

Analysis

First, cohesive harmony analysis was completed on the children's reconstructed texts independently by two trained scorers. During the process of cohesive harmony analysis, a series of judgments were made. Agreement between scorers was necessary in placing tokens in participant and process chains, in identifying peripheral and ambiguous tokens, and in determining interactions between t-units. In addition, agreement was necessary on computation of the cohesive harmony index-total. For these above series of analyses, interrater agreement ranged from 82% to 91%, with total reconciliation of all scoring disagreements. (See Cox, 1987 for a detailed description of procedures in cohesive harmony analysis. Examples of cohesive harmony analysis of young children's texts are found in Cox, 1990; Otto, 1990b, 1991a.)

Comparisons of group means were made across two text types (beginning reader and complex text) and two classes (a.m. and p.m.) for the pre and post story

reconstructions using t-tests. Correlational analysis was conducted on pre-post paired scores for individual children to explore the nature of the relationship between scores for the two collections.

Results

Emergent readers reconstructed texts of varying degrees of cohesive harmony (range CHI-total = .00 to .94); however, only five children reconstructed texts that were below the level suggested as being linguistically significant in cohesive harmony (Hasan, 1984).

Pre-project levels of cohesive harmony

When children's story reconstructions were analyzed the first step was to determine whether text type was associated with differences in cohesive harmony at preassessment, before children were systematically exposed to different text types. (See Table 2)

Insert Table 2 about here

In the October preassessment the morning class

showed similar levels of cohesive harmony (CHI-total) across both text types (M= .70 v. .73, p> .05, t=.4305); however, the afternoon class exhibited significant differences between text types, with complex texts having lower cohesive harmony (M= .72 v .37, p< .01, t=3.8092). Thus, differences between the two classes existed at the start of the project, although these two classes were both considered high in school readiness. For the morning class cohesive harmony did not vary with text type but the afternoon class differed significantly.

Correlational analysis was conducted to explore further the nature of differences between these two groups. Correlational analysis of paired scores (for two text types) for the two classes in October found no significant relationships (a.m. class r=.53 p>.05; p.m. class r=.56 p> .05) Thus, for both classes, children's use of cohesive harmony in reconstructing one text type was not predictive of the cohesive harmony of the second text type.

This finding is particularly interesting with

respect to the p.m. class. While the p.m. class as a group reconstructed complex text at significantly lower levels of cohesive harmony than the beginning reader text, some individual p.m. children who had greater cohesive harmony on the beginning reader text, did not have higher cohesive harmony on the complex text. For example Jennifer's reconstruction of beginning reader text had a CHI-total of .70, while her reconstruction of traditional text had a CHI-total of .00 (no cohesive harmony). See Figure 1 for excerpts of Jennifer's story reconstructions.

Insert Figure 1 about here

In contrast, Rachel's reconstruction of beginning reader text had a CHI-total of .68 and her reconstruction of traditional text had a CHI-total of .62. See Figure 2 for excerpts of Rachel's text reconstructions.

Insert Figure 2 about here

Similar variation was present between other p.m. children. Variation was found in a more limited way among the a.m. class as well. These findings seem to indicate important individual differences in text-making knowledge related to reconstructing simple and complex text.

Pre and Post Scores within Text Types

The next analysis examined pre and post scores within text types for each class with respect to differences in text-type exposure, as the a.m. class had been read and given complex story texts, while the p.m. class had been read and given beginning reader texts; however, for pre and post assessments children had been equally exposed to the two specific texts that would be used in the research task.

Beginning reader text. Although the specific beginning reader text changed from October to January, children's exposure to each text was similar (1 week prior to assessment) and the two texts shared similar characteristics with respect to cohesive harmony, length, and the presence of patterned language.

Analyses using t-tests for correlated scores were

conducted for each text type. The morning class' pre and post scores varied little (M= .70 v. .72) while the afternoon class showed a decrease in cohesive harmony with beginning reader text from October to January (M= .72 v. .49) that approached significance ($p < .10$, $t = 2.1108$, $df = 7$). (See Table 3)

Insert Table 3 about here

In addition, p.m. children's scores in October were not significantly correlated to their scores in January ($r = -.3027$, $p > .05$), which indicates a lack of relationship between the level of cohesive harmony present in both text reconstructions. While some children's scores in January were higher than their scores on similar text types in October, other children's scores in January decreased or stayed very similar to their scores in October.

Complex text. Complex text was reconstructed at similar levels by the a.m. class at pre and post assessment (M= .73 v. .71, $p > .05$). The p.m. class' post CHI-total mean showed a slight increase from the

preassessment, though it was not significant; however, it still was much lower than the a.m. class'. (See Table 4).

Insert table 4 about here

It may be the small subsample exaggerates individual differences which would be less powerful in a larger sample; however the relationship between exposure to text type and children's use of cohesive harmony in text reconstruction does not appear to be a simple one. Unidentified factors may have been functioning in the classroom or in the children's homes which differentially influenced the story reconstruction. Further research with a larger sample in an attempt to identify intervening variables is warranted.

Repeated Text

The beginning reader text that was first introduced in October and used in the preassessment (Mrs. Wishy Washy) was also used during postassessment to explore the relationship between repeated text and

text facilitates text reconstruction, then a task involving reconstruction of such text would result in higher levels of cohesive harmony at post assessment.

In this study, both groups were exposed to Mrs. Wishy Washy for a week prior to the preassessment. Then the p.m. class was given a copy of the book to take home and keep. The a.m. class received another book (traditional text), but had a copy of Mrs. Wishy Washy left in their shared classroom. If familiarity with the text is important, the p.m. post scores on Mrs. Wishy Washy would be expected to increase, while the a.m. class' scores on that text would be expected to decrease because the a.m. class did not have a copy of the book at home. This prediction was not realized. CHI-total score means for the two classes' reconstruction of Mrs. Wishy Washy remained very similar from pre to post assessment (a.m. M= .70 v. .74; p.m. M= .72 v. .78). No significant differences were found. (See Table 5)

Insert Table 5 about here

It appears that simply having a copy of the storybook at home was not sufficient to be associated with higher levels of cohesive harmony. This finding echoes a conclusion reached by Morrow, O'Connor & Smith (1990) that providing books alone is not sufficient. A more important factor is the nature of the adult-to-child, and child-to-child interaction that surrounds the use of books. Future study should include an exploration of social interaction accompanying different text types.

While the p.m. class' reconstruction of the repeated text (Mrs. Wishy Washy) did not vary significantly between pre and post test, it is important to note that their reconstruction of Mrs. Wishy Washy at the post test was significantly higher ($p<.05$) than their reconstruction of both other texts (the new beginning reader and the new traditional text).

Insert Table 6 about here

Children's scores for the new beginning reader

text in January were significantly lower than their scores of Mrs. Wishy Washy, the previously used beginning reader text (M=.49 v. .78, t= 2.240, p < .05, df=7). A similarly significant contrast was found when children's scores on Mrs. Wishy Washy were compared with their cohesive harmony scores on the new complex text (Harry the Dirty Dog), (M= .48 v. 78, t= 2.834, p< .05, df=7).

The a.m. and p.m. classes appeared to respond differently to text type and text exposure, which indicates not only individual differences but may signal class-related differences.

Discussion and Implications

This study documents differences in text-making knowledge held by a group of inner city kindergarten children prior to being able to read conventionally. It appeared from these results that there are complex relationships between text type, cohesive harmony, and text familiarity.

Although the two classes studied in this project were considered by the school to be the top two kindergarten classes in terms of "readiness", the

different levels of cohesive harmony present in their story reconstructions at the beginning of the project indicates that cohesive harmony analysis might be tapping knowledge that traditional readiness measures do not assess.

The lack of correlation between cohesive harmony scores across and within text types for individual children both pre and post assessments may indicate children's interactions with print are not stable and are influenced by factors yet to be fully identified.

It is possible that variables associated with classroom storybook interaction as well as storybook interaction at home influenced children's reconstruction of text, so that it was a matter of how the child had used the books which influenced text reconstruction.

Although the subsample used in this research was selected to provide a clearly defined group for study, the small number involved places a limitation on the study. This study only examined children's story reconstructions that occurred as a result of independent interaction in all five of the story

reconstructions. This eliminated 16 children who had one or more assisted storybook interactions. This may have created a subsample that was too homogeneous, having little variability with respect to composition-related knowledge (i.e. cohesive harmony) to illustrate developmental patterns. Perhaps further exploration of this data on a case study basis would clarify developmental issues.

In summary, there was no clear pattern of significant differences of cohesive harmony in emergent readers' reconstruction of text types. Using simple, beginning reader texts was not associated with higher levels of cohesive harmony in reconstructing texts. The exploration of individual and class-related factors needs to be included in future research. It is also important to examine the text-making knowledge of young children from contrasting literacy environments, e.g. high literacy v. low literacy, as well as longitudinal study of the development of specific text-making knowledge from emergent literacy to conventional literacy.

The acquisition of reading and writing skills is

a critical concern in any educational system. Many children currently fail to become functionally literate (Committee for Economic Development, 1987). We need to learn how to better design instruction to develop children's literacy knowledge so that they can be competent in oral and written communication. As researchers and educators, we first need to know what literacy-related knowledges are developing prior to formal instruction. Then we can better examine the appropriateness of formal instruction and specific curricula. Through continued exploration of children's acquisition of text-making knowledge and the role of exposure to text of varying complexity it will be possible to more appropriately select and develop curriculum materials.

REFERENCES

Applebee, A. (1978). The child's concept of story: Ages two to seventeen. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Baumann, J. (1986). Teaching third-grade students to comprehend anaphoric relationships: The application of a direct instruction model. Reading Research Quarterly, 21, 70-90.

Bridge, C. (1986). Predictable books for beginning readers and writers. In M.R. Sampson (Ed.), The pursuit of literacy: Early readers and writers. (81-96). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.

Chapman, J. (1977). Reading from 5-11 years. Milton Keyes, UK: Open University Press.

Clay, M. (1991). Becoming literate. Auckland: Heinemann.

Committee for Economic Development. (1987). Children in need: Investment strategies for the educationally disadvantaged. A statement by the research and policy committee. New York: Author.

Cox, B. (1983). Tracking "it" through the woods and down the trail from emergent to independent reading.

In J.A. Niles & L.A. Harris (Eds.), Searches for meaning in reading/language processing and instruction: Thirty-second yearbook of the National Reading Conference. (243-250). Rochester, NY.

Cox, B. (1987). Cohesion and content organization in the narrative and expository writing of children. Doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University. (University microfilms #DAO 58785).

Cox, B. (1990). Complex structural knowledge in preschoolers' and kindergartners' oral and written monologue attempts. Paper presented at the National Reading Conference, Miami, FL.

Cox, B. (in press). "At-risk" preschoolers' emerging control over literacy: Issues of observation, evaluation and instruction. Reading and Writing Quarterly.

Cox, B. & Hoon, J. (1991). "At Risk" preschoolers' use of written English structure in constructing their own monologues for others. Paper presented at the National Reading Conference, Palm Springs.

Cox, B., Shanahan, T. & Sulzby, E. (1990). Good and poor elementary readers' use of cohesion in writing.

Reading Research Quarterly, 25(3).

Cox, B., Shanahan, T. & Tinzmann, M. (1991). Children's knowledge of organization, cohesion and voice in written exposition. Research in the Teaching of English, 25, 179-218.

Cox, B. & Sulzby, E. (1984). Children's use of reference in told, dictated, and handwritten stories. Research in the Teaching of English, 18, 345-366.

Doake, D. (1981, May). Book experiences and emergent readings behaviors. Paper presented at the International Reading Conference, Atlanta.

Dyson, A. (1981). Oral language: The rooting system for learning to write. Language Arts, 58, 776-784.

Friedman, L. & Sulzby, E. (1987). Cohesive harmony analysis: Issues of text pragmatics and macrostructure. Research in literacy: Merging perspectives, 297-305.

Halliday, M.A.K. & Hasan, R. (1976). Cohesion in English. London, Longman Group Limited.

Hasan, R. (1984). Coherence and cohesive harmony. In J.

Flood (Ed.), Understanding reading comprehension. Newark, NJ: International Reading Association, 181-219.

Holdaway, D. (1979). The foundations of literacy. Sydney: Ashton Scholastic.

Jewell, M. & Zintz, K. (1990). Learning to read and write naturally. (2nd ed.) Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.

King, M. (1989). Speech to writing: Children's growth in writing potential. In J. Mason (Ed.), Reading and writing connections. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

King, M. & Rentel, V. (1981). How children learn to write: A longitudinal study. (RF Project 761861/ 712383 and 761513/711748, Final Report, June) Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University.

Kintsch, W. (1972). The representation of meaning in memory. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

McCormick, C. & Mason, J. (1986, September). Use of little books at home: A minimal intervention strategy that fosters early reading. Technical report No. 388. Champaign, IL: Center for the Study

of Reading, University of Illinois.

Morrow, L. (1989). Literacy development in the early years: Helping children read and write. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Morrow, L., O'Connor, E., & Smith, J. (1990) Effects of a story reading program on the literacy development of at-risk kindergarten children. Journal of Reading Behavior, 22(3), 255-275.

Otto, B. (1984). Evidence of emergent reading behaviors in young children's interactions with favorite storybooks. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Northwestern University, Evanston, Il.

Otto, B. (1990). Structural features in stories created by academically-able young children. Paper presented at the National Reading Conference, Miami, FL.

Otto, B. (1991a). Cohesive harmony in stories reconstructed by emergent readers. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Conference, Chicago, IL.

Otto, B. (1991b). Informal assessment of emergent reading behaviors through observations of assisted

and independent storybook interactions. Paper presented at the International Reading Conference, Las Vegas, NV, May.

Otto, B. (in press) Signs of emergent literacy among inner-city kindergartners in a storybook reading program. Reading and Writing Quarterly.

Pappas, C. (1981). The development of narrative capabilities within a synergistic, variable perspective of language development: An examination of cohesive harmony produced in three contexts-retelling, dictating, writing. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.

Pappas, C. (1985). Cohesive harmony and cohesive density of children's oral and written stories. In J. Benson & W. Greaves (Eds.), Systemic perspectives on discourse Volume 2, 169-186, Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Schickedanz, J. & Sullivan, M. (1984). "Mom, What does U-F-F spell?" Language Arts, 61, 7-17.

Spiegel, D. & Fitzgerald, J. (1990). Textual cohesion and coherence in children's writing revisited. Research in the Teaching of English, 24, 1, 48-66.

Stein, N. (1978). How children understand stories: A

developmental analysis. Technical Report No. 69. Champaign, IL: Center for the Study of Reading.

Stein, N. & Glenn, C. (1981). The concept of story: A study of story telling. Paper presented at the meeting of the Portland Neuropsychiatric Institute, Portland, OR.

Sulzby, E. (1985). Kindergartners as writers and readers. In M. Farr (Ed.), Advances in writing research; Volume 1, Children's Early writing development. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 127-199.

Sulzby, E., Barnhart, J. & Hieshima, J. (1989). Forms of writing and rereading from writing. In J. Mason (Ed.), Reading and writing connections, 31-50. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Sulzby, E. & Otto, B. (1982). "Text" as an object of metalinguistic knowledge: A study in literacy development. First Language, 3, 181-199.

Teale, W. (1981). Parents reading to their children: What we know and what we need to know. Language Arts, 58, 902-912.

Teale, W. & Sulzby, E. (Eds.) (1985). Emergent literacy: Writing and reading. Exeter, NH: Heinemann.

Temple, c., Nathan, R., Burris, N., & Temple, F. (1988). The beginning of writing. (2nd ed.) Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Tompkins, G. & McGee, L. (1989). Teaching repetition as a story structure. In D.M. Glynn, (Ed.), Children's comprehension of text. 59-78. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Willert, M. & Kamii, C. (1985). Reading in kindergarten: Direct and indirect teaching. Young Children, 40, 4, 3-9.

Vygotsky, L. (1962). Thought and language. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Appendix

Books Used With Morning Class

Burningham, J. (1973). Mr. Gumpy's motor car. NY: Puffin Books.

Eastman, P.D. (1960). Are you my mother? NY: Random House.

Freeman, D. (1976). Corduroy. NY: Puffin Rooks.

Keats, E.J. (1967). Peter's chair. NY: Harper & Row.

Nodset, J. (1963). Who took the farmer's hat? NY: Harper & Row.

Slobodkina, E. (1987). Caps for sale. NY: Harper & Row.

Zion, G. (1956). Harry the dirty dog. NY: Harper & Row.

Books Used With Afternoon Class

Crowley, J. (1980). Mrs. Wishy Washy. Auckland, New Zealand: Shortland Publications.

Crowley, J. (1982). Stop! Auckland, New Zealand: Shortland Publications.

Crowley, J. (1986). Little brother. San Diego, CA: The Wright Group.

Crowley, J. (1986). A hug is warm. San Diego, CA: The Wright Group.

Crowley, J. (1988). Feet. Auckland, New Zealand: Shortland Publications.

Cutting, J. (1988) Getting dressed. San Diego, CA: The Wright Group.

Cutting, J.(1988). Shopping. San Diego, CA: The Wright Group

Table 1

Characteristics of Books Used

Book	# t-units	CHI-total
Beginning Reader Texts		
Mrs. Wishy Washy (pre and post)	19	.92
Stop! (post)	9	.81
Trade Book (complex) Texts		
Mr. Gumpy's Motor Car (pre)	72	1.00
Harry the Dirty Dog (post)	59	.92

Table 2

Pre Assessment Cohesive Harmony Index-Total Mean Scores By Class and Text-Type

CHI-total Mean Scores

Class	Beginning Reader		Complex Text	
A.M. (n=5)	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
October	.70	.20	.73	.14
P.M. (n=7)				
October	.72	.06	.37**	.27

**Significance at the p<.01 level.

Table 3

Pre and Post CHI-total Score Means for Beginning Reader Texts for Both Classes

Class	Score Means for Beginning Reader Texts	
a.m.	Mean	SD
October (pre)	.70	.20
January (post)	.72	.15
p.m.		
October (pre)	.72	.06
January (post)	.49[1]	.26

Note:

[1] Approached significance, $t=2.1108$, $p< .10$, $df=7$.

Table 4

Pre and Post CHI-total Score Means for Complex Trade Book Text for Both Classes

Class	Score Means for Complex Text	
	Mean	SD
a.m.		
October (pre)	.73	.14
January (post)	.71	.11
p.m.		
October (pre)	.37	.27
January (post)	.49	.24

Note:

t-tests indicated no significant differences between group means for two texts within each class.

Table 5

Pre and Post CHI-total Score Means for Repeated Text for Both Classes

Class	Score Means for Repeated Text	
	Mean	SD
a.m.		
October (pre)	.70	.20
January (post)	.74	.11
p.m.		
October (pre)	.72	.13
January (post)	.78	.17

Table 6

Post CHI-total Score Means for All Texts for Both Classes

Class	Score Means for Texts		
	New Beginning Reader	Repeated Text	New Complex Text
a.m.	.72	.74	.71
p.m.	.49[1]	.78	.49[2]

Note:

[1] t-test indicated significant difference at $p < .05$ with the repeated text.

[2] t-test indicated significant difference at $p < .05$ with the repeated text.

Figure 1

Excerpts from Jennifer's Reconstructed Texts

Beginning Reader: Mrs. Wishy Washy

"Lovely mud said the cow and the cow jumped in it. Lovely mud said the pig and the pig rolled in it. Lovely mud said the duck and the duck paddled in it. Get in that tub o' cow. Wishy wash, wishy wash. In the tub went the pig. Wishy wash, wishy wash. In the tub went the duck, wishy wash, wishy wash. Down went the cow. Down went the pig. Down went the duck. And they, and they all said, lovely mud." (CHI-total score = .70)

Complex Text: Mr. Gumpy's Motor Car

"In go in the car. (pages turning)
He saw all the kids. Asked can we go?
They had to get out and push.
That's all.
(CHI-total score = .00, no cohesive harmony)

Figure 2

Excerpts from Rachel's Reconstruction of Both Text Types

Beginning Reader: Mrs. Wishy Washy

"What lovely soap said the cow and she jumped in it. What, what lovely mud said the pig and he rolled in it. What lovely mud said the goose and she, and she's paddled in it, in it here and Mrs Wishy Wash came. She screamed. In the tub went cow. Wishy washy, wishy washy. In the tub went pig. Wishy washy, wishy washy. In the tub went goose. Wishy washy, wishy washy. And she went back in the house. And they, and they all ran away. What lovely mud said the pig, the, the cow, the, and the goose."
(CHI-total score = .68)

Complex Text: Mr. Gumpy's Motor Car

"Mr. Gumpy's Motor Car. There's his motor car. Mr. Gumpy was going for a ride in his motor car. He dr--drove down the lane and out the gate. He got out, then, the boy and the girl asked if they could come. The goat, the cow, the sheep, and the hen, too. So did the Pig. And off they went. I do not like the--the way those clouds look (turns page). I do not like the way those

clouds look (turns page). I do not like the way those clouds look (turns page). I think it is gonna rain. I think some of you are going to have to get out and push....(CHI-total score = .62)